

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JASON SWANSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 19-cv-321-pp

v.

NANCY A. BERRYHILL,

Defendant.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED WITHOUT
PREPAYMENT OF THE FILING FEE (DKT. NO. 3)**

The plaintiff has filed a complaint seeking judicial review of a final administrative decision denying his claim for disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act. Dkt. No. 1. He also filed a motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 3.

To allow the plaintiff to proceed without paying the filing fee, the court first must decide whether the plaintiff can pay the fee; if not, it must determine whether the lawsuit is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. §§1915(a) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

The plaintiff used the form for seeking to appeal to the Seventh Circuit without paying the filing fee, rather than the form for seeking such relief in the district court. Despite that fact, the information he included in the affidavit states that he has “no form of income except \$192 in food stamps.” Dkt. No. 3 at 6. The plaintiff lists no other sources of income, no employment, no spouse with employment, no cash on hand or in bank accounts, no assets and no

money owed to him from any source. Id. at 2-5. The plaintiff's affidavit lists no expenses other than monthly food expenses of \$192. Id. at 5. The plaintiff has demonstrated that he cannot pay the \$350 filing fee and \$50 administrative fee.


The next step is to determine whether the case is frivolous. A case is frivolous if there is no arguable basis for relief either in law or in fact. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992) (quoting Nietzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Casteel v. Pieschek, 3 Fed. 1050, 1056 (7th Cir. 1993)). A person may obtain district court review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security. 42 U.S.C. §405(g). The district court must uphold the Commissioner's final decision as long as the Commissioner used the correct legal standards and the decision is supported by substantial evidence. See Roddy v. Astrue, 705 F.3d 631, 636 (7th Cir. 2013).

The plaintiff's complaint states that the decision finding the plaintiff not disabled "is not in accordance with the purpose and intent of the Social Security Act, nor is it in accordance with the evidence, but contrary thereto, in that the ALJ's decision is not supported by substantial evidence and is contrary to law." Dkt. No. 1 at 2. At this early stage in the case, and based on the information in the plaintiff's complaint, the court concludes that there may be a basis in law or in fact for the plaintiff's appeal of the Commissioner's decision, and that the appeal may have merit, as defined by 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

The court **GRANTS** the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 3.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 19th day of April, 2019.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Pepper', written over a horizontal line.

HON. PAMELA PEPPER
United States District Judge